

## HE WANTED \$10,000

AND HIS WIFE TOLD OF HER OWN SHAME

In Order to Get It—The Miller-Montgomery Case One of the Dirtiest Ever Heard in a Stark County Court—The Testimony of the Important Witnesses Given.

Miss Allie Letz, dressmaker, who has a shop across the street, testified that she had seen Mr. Montgomery visit the Miller home every week during certain forenoon. On cross-examination witness said she had seen both families go riding together, with the exception of Mr. Miller.

Thomas Wolf was next called. He lived near Miller's house. Mr. Miller was not at home in the summer of 1895; he was working away. Saw Mr. Montgomery go to the Miller home quite often, both forenoon and afternoon, right after 1 o'clock in the afternoon. He generally left at about 4 o'clock before school closed. The children went to school. Cross-examined by Mr. Wertz, for the defendant, Mr. Wolf said he saw Mr. Montgomery go as much with Mr. Miller as without him.

The next witness was L. E. Shankle. He saw Miller and Montgomery by the beard and heard the latter tell him to let go, one day last summer. Miller called him a bad name. Mr. Miller was working in Columbiana and Alliance during the summer of 1895 and came home every two weeks.

Mrs. Miller, wife of the plaintiff, then took the stand. Said her full name was Frances Clementine Miller. She had known Mr. Montgomery since childhood. She married Mr. Miller in 1880, had had four children one being dead. Her relations with her husband from the time of marriage till 1894 were happy. Had met Mr. Montgomery often at the M. E. church in Osnaburg, on Sundays and week days. In 1895 both families left that church. In summer of 1895 her husband worked in Columbiana was away from home most of the time. During that time she rode out with Mr. Montgomery and wife. Mr. Montgomery first began calling on her in the summer of 1894. From April 1, '95, to January, '96, he continued calling on her, both during day and night, while her husband was away. He preferred to come while Mr. Miller was away, after calling in the morning. When children were in school the defendant called during the daytime; when home in vacation he came during the evening. There was correspondence between them, the first note being handed her before the families left the M. E. church. He handed the notes to her as they passed. Previous to that Mr. Montgomery had expressed his affection for her, some time in 1894. He always favored her in church matters. He called on her against the protestations at home. He had told her he would like to live with her and wanted her to go to California with him, so as to get away from his wife. To this she objected, saying she would not leave her home and children. During his visits he took improper liberties with her, commencing in the year '95. She went riding with him in evenings in a closed carriage. They had criminal intercourse first in 1895, she said. He told her that her husband did not care for her, and with all his talk she began to think that it was true. He had told her he liked her better than any woman he had ever seen. These relations continued until the spring of 1896. Touching on the passing of notes between each other, she said Mr. Montgomery first proposed it. She turned all but these which were introduced. While she addressed his letters as "Dear Wife," she only addressed her's as "Friend," to which he objected stating that he wished she would call him "Dear Husband." He referred to his wife, Mr. Montgomery, as a "crank." He had furnished Mrs. Miller with candy and had promised her money if she ever needed it. He wanted to get her a ring, but she refused to accept one. Mrs. Miller did not know that Mr. Montgomery's visits were intended as an indication of love until when he finally told her in 1894.

"Do you love your husband now?" asked Mr. Wertz.

"No, sir, I cannot love him again as I once did," was her reply.

Attorney James Sterling then began cross-examination by asking when she was born. She said, "I don't know."

What can't remember when you were born?" he continued.

"Well, in 1860," she replied.

"When were your children born?" asked Mr. Sterling.

"I can't remember when they were born."

"Have you no record?"

"No, sir."

How long did your first child, that died, live?" asked the attorney.

"But a few days," she replied.

"It was born only a few months after your marriage, was it not?"

This was objected to by the attorneys for plaintiff, and sustained.

He then inquired about the beginning of the correspondence, and asked if she did not first hand Mr. Montgomery a letter asking him to call on her, she answered: "No, sir. He handed me a letter at the very first."

Inquiry was made as to the matter of love and how she acted when Mr. Montgomery first talked love, and what she said.

She replied that she admonished him.

"When he kissed me he told me that they were sweet kisses."

From 1895 to 1896 Mr. Montgomery called often, day and night, against her wishes, continually expressed. She had referred to her husband as "this man," because, as she said in reply to Mr. Sterling's hot shot, Mr. Montgomery had referred to his wife as a "crank."

"What did you do when Mr. Montgomery called on you?" You did not scream, did you? There was a dressing establishment across the street, wasn't there?"

"No, I just told him he should leave me alone. That he ought not to do such things," she replied.

"You never told anybody about the gross improprieties he took with you, did you?"

"No, sir. I never told anybody."

"You wrote him right along, after these visits in which he took such liberties with you, didn't you? Wrote him love letters, didn't you?"

"Yes, but I told him to stay away."

"He returned right along, did he not?"

"Yes, sir."

Further answering the questions propounded by Attorney Sterling she said she had sat on his lap since her requests for him to stay away, but that it was against her wishes. He insisted. She continued to kiss him, and threw her arms around his neck once when he told her, this led on to the matter of criminal intimacy and the facts brought out are not fit to appear in type, although attentively listened to by women and men who, by this time, had begun to come into the court room from the rear, causing an order from Judge McCarthy to the bailiff to lock the back door.

After the review of these matters Mr. Sterling asked more about the letters, and she said they had continued to correspond after her protestation to Mr. Montgomery's rude conduct.

The matter of an anonymous letter having reached Mr. Miller was touched upon, whereupon Mrs. Miller declared it was a fraud. She said she thought it was written by Mr. Wertz, the attorney for the defendant with Mr. Sterling, the former being a relative of the Montgomerys.

Church matters were next reviewed by the attorney in cross examination, but nothing new brought out except that she had at one time asked Mrs. Montgomery what was wrong with her that she had grown cold, whereupon Mrs. Montgomery replied, saying, "Enough," and then turned her back upon Mrs. Miller, and this hurt her feelings. Mr. Sterling asked if Mrs. Miller had not been told by a neighbor that she ought to separate from her husband before they commenced suit, to which she replied "no." Several questions asked as to whether Mrs. Miller had not told Mr. Montgomery other men were in love with her and also as to whether she did not lead in voluntary prayer in church after her actions with Mr. Montgomery were known, were objected to and objections noted. Mrs. Miller stated that she and her husband continued to go to church occasionally and that she had never left him for any length of time, and that they were living together notwithstanding this action in court. This ended Mrs. Miller's testimony.

W. H. Clark was next called. He was a resident of Osnaburg, well acquainted with both the plaintiff and defendant. Had seen Mr. Montgomery enter the Miller house at various times at night. Thought Mr. Miller was working in Columbiana. Cross-examined Mr. Clark said he was on his way home from up town when he saw Mr. Montgomery. It was a light night and he was within twenty-five steps of Montgomery.

The next witness was Jacob Libtag, who was totally blind. He is postmaster of Osnaburg. Had heard altercation between Miller and Montgomery one day. Miller had stopped Montgomery and said he wanted to make a settlement with him. He had said: "Montgomery, I thought you were a gentleman, a Christian and a brother; but I know now that you are a black-hearted scoundrel. You ought to get a rope and go out and hang yourself instead of interfering with other men's families." Montgomery had replied that he wanted no trouble with Miller and had no time to bother with him.

Cross-examined, Mr. Libtag said he could not remember the month, but the affair occurred at noon one day in 1896. The first he had heard of any trouble between the Millers and Montgomerys was when Mrs. Montgomery left her husband. Libtag made a splendid witness for the prosecution.

Mrs. Jacob Miller, a sister-in-law to Mr. Miller, the plaintiff, was the next. She had seen Montgomery leave the Miller house once rather rapidly, as Mr. Miller had entered on the other side of the house.

Mrs. Samuel Meiser, of Osnaburg, was next called. She lives adjoining the Miller residence. Had seen Mr. Montgomery enter the Miller house after the children went to school, and had seen him sneak out and go home when the children were expected home. He had been there at other times and she had seen him "slunk" out at various times. On cross-examination when asked if she was a self-constituted watcher, she said, "No, I was not but I could not help watching a married man when he called on a married woman so frequently." Mrs. Meiser was a very willing witness and did not confuse her answers directly to the questions asked.

"The Millers and Montgomerys were rather intimate, were they not?" asked Mr. Sterling.

"Well, that wasn't my fault, was it?" replied Mrs. Meiser.

"No, I did not say it was, did I?" said Mr. Sterling.

"Well, you talk that way," said Mrs. Meiser.

"No," interjected Attorney McCarthy, "Mr. Sterling always talks that way."

The next question was: "When did Mr. Miller join the new church?" to which Mrs. Meiser replied: "I do not know exactly, but I wasn't to blame for her joining," which caused a ripple of laughter in the court room. Mr. Sterling had a good deal of fun with the witness.

Deputy County Clerk J. A. Bilas, and Dr. Davis, of Osnaburg were sworn, but nothing of special interest was elicited from their testimony.

FRIDAY'S SESSION.

The first witness was John W. Montgomery, the defendant. Attorney Sterling conducted the examination. Montgomery said he was married September 17, 1877, to Miss Sausser of Osnaburg. Three children were born, two of whom are living. The oldest daughter is now 17 and the youngest 15 years of age. Montgomery's testimony with the unimportant features omitted, was, in substance, as follows:

"Have known the plaintiff, Mr. Miller, all my life. Knew Mrs. Miller from childhood, having lived in the same neighborhood. Our families have been intimate prior to the commencing of this case, and we were also associated in church circles. We began to visit back and forth as families during '94 or '95, at the solicitation of Mr. and Mrs. Miller. My relations with Mrs. Miller at that time were not intimate, merely social."

"When did the intimacy begin?" was asked.

"In March or April of '95, answered the witness. "Mrs. Montgomery and I attended the Epworth League entertainment about that date and Mr. and Mrs. Miller were there. The gentlemen occupied one side of the church and the ladies the other side. When we left the church Mrs. Miller sat on the left occupied by the men. She remained sitting there, and as I went out she passed a note into my hand. At that solicitation we went over to the Miller residence to see them. That was the first note I received although I had noticed that Mrs. Miller would come around to me after services. She would ask me questions in regard to Sunday-school matters. She kept this up for about six months. Her conduct was unduly friendly, and she was very smiling. She met me every Sabbath. I destroyed the note she gave me, after reading it. The note was an invitation to call at her residence as she wanted to talk to me. I called upon her in about a week and found her at home and had a talk with her. She said she wanted to see me because she thought a great deal of me and had fallen in love with me. I remained about a half hour and she invited me to call again."

I gave her a note at church one evening about two months after our first meeting. Between the times the notes were passed I called at the Miller residence three or four times. I found Mrs. Miller and some of the family there every time I called.

"It was some time during the fall of '95 that she first sat on my knee. I was sitting in their sitting room at this time, in a rocking chair. She stood near by me and I said, 'You may sit on my lap,' and she sat down and remained sitting on my lap for a short time, and talked of love. She said she loved me and had loved me for a long time. She spoke to me about Rev. Ross, and said he had thought a great deal of her, and had called on her when he came to Osnaburg, and that she had corresponded with him. She said Mr. Schuffele tried to 'get around her,' and that Mr. Armstrong had said she was pretty and had a fine complexion. She also said that Mr. Emmet, the lecturer, thought a great deal of her and she had had a good time with him and then David Shively, a drummer called and they had good times together and lots of fun. She said further that she had many admirers. Mrs. Miller never told me that our familiarity was wrong, and she did not tell me to remain away from her home, but on the contrary she had invited me to call again every time I left her. I never told her of her actions. I never told her of her actions. I never told her of her actions."

"There was some hugging and kissing."

"Yes, but I cannot tell who began the hugging and kissing."

"There was no intimacy with the exception of her sitting on my knee and hugging and kissing. I received an anonymous letter and gave it to Mrs. Miller and at that time I told her that the matter of our friendship was making trouble and we had better quit, and she told me to pay no attention to it. I then told Mr. Miller that my going to his house was causing talk and he said that he had seen some letters and he thought they were written to get up trouble between the families. I went riding with Mrs. Miller at night just once. She invited me to go with her at that time. I met her in the street and she asked me if I wouldn't take a drive. We drove to Kuntz Memorial church and around that way and she alighted near her house. I had a talk with Mr. Miller about that drive. He asked me if I had been out driving with his wife, that his wife had told him that she had been driving with me. I said: 'John, if you think there's any harm in my calling at your house, or speaking to your woman, I shall not do it.' John said: 'You do not forsake us, as there are people in town who would be too glad if you did not come to our house.' I met Mr. Miller up town a few days after and went to his house with him. Mrs. Miller was there. There was nothing said on the question of the buggy ride at that time. The question at that time came up about my family being opposed to my coming to the Miller house. Mr. Miller said he didn't want me to give up coming and I said my coming there was making trouble, but they both insisted upon my continuing my visits. I told Mrs. Miller that my wife objected to my coming to her home, but she insisted, that I should come, and said she would make me trouble if I did not come."

"The last time my wife called at the Miller residence with me was in October, '95. We went there from church in the morning at the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Miller, and staid there until the evening service. Some time after the trouble between our families, Mr. and Mrs. Miller stopped our carriage one evening, and Mrs. Miller said to my wife: 'What is the matter with you Mrs. Montgomery?' My wife replied: 'There's nothing the matter with me, Mrs. Miller. What's the matter with you?' And after that there was a coldness between our families."

"In a letter I received from Mrs. Miller she addressed me as 'Dear Husband.' She said in a letter received in February, '96 that she wanted me to come and see her, as she would come to see me."

see her, as she would come to see me. Her continuous solicitations were the cause of my infatuation. Mr. Miller never expressed any dissatisfaction at my calls. The reason the latter stopped, was that the last letter I received was left where my wife got it and she left my house, going to my brother's, and then to her sister's Mrs. Herman Wertz. I never told Mrs. Miller her husband did not care for her nor did I ever ask her to go to California with me. I never offered a ring to her; never bought her anything, not even candy; and never offered her money. I never made a practice of winking and blinking at Mrs. Miller in church."

All this was in direct reply to the questions asked by Attorney Sterling.

SPICY DIALOGUE.

Mr. Wertz then commenced his cross-examination. He asked if witness was not superintendent of the Methodist Sunday-school when he was visiting Mrs. Miller in 1895, to which witness replied that he was. He had been mayor of Osnaburg four years, also justice of the peace, a school teacher at one time way back, and a farmer. Commenced calling on Mrs. Miller after receiving the first note from her in church.

"Did you show the letter to your wife?"

"No, sir."

"Why not?"

"Because I knew it was wrong."

"By your testimony this morning you claim to have been seduced by Mrs. Miller, do you?" inquired Mr. Wertz.

This was objected to and objection sustained when the laughter subsided.

"I destroyed the note," said Montgomery in reply to a question by Wertz. "I know it was wrong. I knew that she had a husband; that I had a wife and that we had children and all that. Yet I went because she drew me on."

"What did you mean in your letter when you said: 'Our drives were always pleasant, rain or shine, clear or cloudy?'"

"I meant just what I said," replied Montgomery.

"It wasn't pleasant outside the buggy, rainy nights, was it?" asked Mr. Wertz.

"No, sir, but it was in the buggy," replied the witness, and the crowd laughed.

"When did you tell Miller that you were hugging and kissing his wife?" asked the attorney.

"I never did tell him."

"Why not?"

"Why, because I did not want him to know it."

"What did you do when she sat in your lap?"

"Why, I let her sit there."

"Did you tell your wife or daughters about these things?"

"Certainly did not. I knew it was wrong, and I told her so, but she kept drawing me on."

"When did you first call your own wife a crank? You did that, didn't you?"

"I don't know. Yes, I did call her a crank."

"When did you first call Mrs. Miller your 'dear wife?'"

"Only in the last three notes," replied the witness. In the course of the questions that followed, Montgomery positively denied ever having been criminally intimate with Mrs. Miller.

Mr. Wertz then read the letters printed in these columns Wednesday, where it spoke about witness wanting "her in his arms." Witness said this was only in case of Miller's dying or something happening to him.

"When you addressed Mrs. Miller as Mrs. Clementine Montgomery did you mean your wife in reality?" asked Mr. Wertz.

"No, sir," replied witness.

"Then why did you follow with the words, 'My dear wife?'"

"Oh, only as words of endearment, I suppose, but not as my real wife."

In continuing the cross-examination of Defendant Montgomery, Mr. Wertz produced the letter that Mrs. Montgomery positively denied ever having been criminally intimate with Mrs. Miller. Montgomery acknowledged writing it, and Mr. Wertz endeavored to read it in court, although it was not plain and he had to study it.

The letter spoke of Mrs. Miller's having another one to pass to Mr. Montgomery, but it was so large that she could not pass it to him in church, and she spoke of his calling at the house, by way of the alley, for it. The writer spoke of their going to Canton together, and also of a Mrs. Al. Myers, who had moved across the street from the Miller home in Osnaburg and who would likely watch everything going on. She also stated that her husband was working on the road between Osnaburg and Canton at certain hours in the day and was home at night time, to which the writer added: "You see the point."

Mr. Wertz asked if he "saw the point," but witness did not reply, and he continued by asking the witness if he did not visit Mrs. Miller during her days in which Mr. Miller was employed on the road, to which witness replied that he had.

"You kissed and hugged her on these occasions, did you not?"

"I don't think I did," replied Montgomery.

Mr. Wertz referred to certain things in the letters already printed, and asked what was meant by his words that "he would like to see her with that new dress." Witness did not say, as objections were made.

The attorney reviewed numerous other statements made by witness in his letters to Mrs. Miller, asking what he really meant by certain sentences.

"You knew you had won Mrs. Miller's feelings, didn't you?" asked Mr. Wertz.

"Yes, sir, if what she told me was true. I did," replied Montgomery.

"When I went by your house today I could not help stopping in and seeing my dear wife, is that what you wrote her?"

"What did you mean? Was your wife there?" asked Mr. Wertz.

"No, sir, I meant Mrs. Miller. I suppose."

"I will not be satisfied until we are one," you wrote her," said Mr. Wertz. "Did you mean that?"

"Yes, I was at that time infatuated with Mrs. Miller, and would have married her probably if we could."

"This note is a little, if you can't read it send for me (I mean your husband)." Who did you mean by 'your husband?'"

"Oh, that's me," the witness said.

"You say 'darling' in your letter to Mrs. Miller. Who do you mean?"

"Oh, that's her," he said, and then the court rapped for order.

Mr. Wertz inquired as to the witness and the defendant in this case having been one of five heirs to the estate of Samuel Montgomery, deceased. He asked as to certain transfers of property that had been made since the date of the commencement of this case, and the replies elicited the fact that since the suit was begun July 11, 1896, he had made numerous transfers.

"Then you have disposed of all your property?"

"Well, yes."

"How much did your wife pay you for the transfer you made to her?"

"Nothing," answered the witness.

"What did the property consist of?"

"There were fifty-six acres in the deed."

The testimony brought out the fact that Mr. Montgomery owed his wife some money, but not the equivalent of the transfer.

Having looked over the letter with reference to the remark about the dress, Judge McCarthy overruled the objection previously made and the witness thereupon answered that he could not tell now what he meant at that time. This ended the cross-examination and Mr. Sterling began a re-direct examination relative to the disposal of property as brought out in cross-examination. Witness said that he owed money at the time he made the transfer and did it for fear of being compelled to assign.

Harmon Wertz was the next witness. He was a brother-in-law of defendant. Plaintiff had asked him for witness and told him that Montgomery and the Millers would have to stop visiting each other, as people were talking about Montgomery and plaintiff's wife. Witness testified that he could tell his brother William's chronograph and that an anonymous letter in question was certainly not written by him.

Jacob Carl had talked with Mr. Miller some time since and plaintiff had said he was on good terms with defendant, but that defendant's wife was jealous of her husband.

A witness who caused a little unusual interest was the next, being Mrs. Montgomery, the wife of the defendant. She was asked by Attorney Sterling about having visited the Miller home in September, '95. She acknowledged having been there at the time by invitation, it being on Sunday. She took dinner and supper there and attended the Kuhn Memorial church in the evening. Her husband went home during the afternoon. The attorney asked about what she had eaten and this was objected to, the judge not being able to see anything material in the evidence. Mr. Sterling said in wanted to show that there was a possible attempt to poison Mrs. Montgomery by giving her coffee, which was untouched by all others, and the result being that Mrs. Montgomery was taken sick suddenly afterward. The evidence was objected to and the objection sustained, and exception noted. Judge McCarthy then told the jury that the reference to this matter was not placed in evidence and that they should not consider it in their deliberations upon the case. A few other unimportant items were brought out and she was excused.

Mrs. Miller was then recalled, when Mr. Sterling asked if she remembered being at the home of a Mr. Mink when she had talked with him and David Carl as to a Mr. Emmet, a lecturer, and stated that she "could marry him without half trying."

Mrs. Miller's answer was, "No, sir, I said no such stuff. I said anybody could like him."

This was all that was desired of her and she was excused.

David Carl was called and he said he was present at the Mink home, being the gentleman referred to in the foregoing. He testified that Mrs. Miller had said she could marry the man Emmet without half trying. Cross-examined by Mr. Wertz, witness said he thought Mrs. Miller was jesting at that time.

Rheumatism Quickly Cured.

After having been confined to the house for eleven days and paying out \$25 in doctor bills without benefit, Mr. Frank Dolson of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., was cured by one bottle of Chamberlain's Pain Balm costing 25 cents, and has not since been troubled with that complaint.

For sale by C. N. Nye, cor. Barnett House, Schlabach's drug store, 225 N. Market, E. L. Johnson, 200 West Tuscarawas street.

To Whom It May Concern.

This is to certify that my loss on barn and contents insured in the Ohio Farmers' Insurance Co., was very satisfactorily adjusted and promptly paid. I heartily recommend the company and also Mr. C. V. Hammons, their agent, to those desiring fire insurance.

Very respectfully,  
Anton Hammyer.

Canton, O., March 6, 1897. (dw)

WILMOT MAN STRICKEN.

George Fogle in an Unconscious Condition and Likely to Die at Any Time.

George Fogle, an aged resident of Wilmot, was stricken with paralysis at his home, Monday morning at 2 o'clock, and is now in an unconscious condition. He is a brother of Mr. Al. Fogle and Mrs. Andrew Wolf, of Canton. Mr. Fogle is 72 years of age.

A drowning man would have little use of a method of rescue, which would require days. A dyspeptic doesn't want to bother with a remedy that is going to take weeks to show its beneficial effects. The Mount Lebanon Shakers are offering a product under the name of Shaker Digestive Cordial which yields immediate relief. The very first dose proves beneficial in most cases and it is owing to their untold confidence in it, that they have put 10-cent sample bottles on the market. These can be had through any druggist; and it will repay the afflicted to invest the trifling sum necessary to make a trial.

The Shaker Digestive Cordial relieves by resting the stomach and aiding the digestion of food.

Laxol is the best medicine for children. Doctors recommend it in place of Castor Oil.

E. E. Turner, of Compton, Mo., writes us that after suffering from piles for seventeen years, he completely cured them by using three boxes of DeWitt's Witch Hazel Salve. It cures eczema and several skin diseases. F. P. Shumfelt & Co., C. N. Nye, Dealer's drug store.

## PETER SAILER,

A PROMINENT MASSILLON CITIZEN, PASSES AWAY.

Blood Poisoning Hastens the End of a Useful Career—One of the Best Known Citizens in the County.

Massillon, March 8, 1897.

For many weeks death has been hovering over the Sailer home in East Main street, and this morning, when all nature was rejoicing in the beauty of the spring sunshine, the dread destroyer entered the quiet home, and soon all that was mortal of the beloved husband and father, was touched by the cold hand of death and the spirit fled to higher realms. Peter Sailer was born in Baden, Germany, in 1839, and in 1868 came to America, and in a short time located in Massillon, where he engaged in the cigar making business, in a building then occupying the site which is now the Hotel Sailer. He was very successful in trade, afterward becoming the owner of the property now known as Hotel Sailer, as well as several other fine sites about the city. Death was caused by blood poisoning, the result of an injury sustained in the right hand. The deceased was a member of the board of health and park commissioners. There is left to mourn his loss, beside his devoted wife, three sons, Gustave, Arthur and Theo, and a daughter, Mrs. Oscar Olsen. Funeral arrangements have not yet been made.

## A FINE HAUL

Made by Burglars Who Looted the Postoffice at Ravenna After Blowing the Safe Open.

Burglars made a fine haul at Ravenna, early Sunday morning and have not been captured as yet. When M. E. King, Postmaster Coolman's assistant, arrived at the office, Sunday, he found that it had been entered during the night. The back door was unlocked. The iron bars which had been put there as a protection had been sawed and the panel in one of the doors leading to the safe had been cut out. Everything was topsy-turvy. On the postmaster's private desk was a sledge hammer, a file and a screw driver. Although the door was on the safe it was evident that the latter had been blown. An examination showed that its contents had been stolen. The money drawers were also relieved of their contents, but the mail was left untouched. The crockmen, with their little stick of dynamite, tools, nerve and experience, secured nearly \$800 in money and stamps, the greater part of it being cash.